

## 1. Introduction

The world is changing therefore a theoretical apparatus of any branch of sociology should be critically reconsidered and developed. The developments of a theoretical apparatus of the sociology of social movements (SSMs) in Russia are going in three directions. First, it is the mastering of a set of approaches and theories developed by western sociologists by their Russian colleagues. From mid-1980s onwards, Russian sociologists of SMs widely used theoretical instruments created by their Western counterparts. Secondly, for the reason of a quite different Russian sociopolitical context it has become necessary to rethink these instruments and to give them more detailed interpretation. In the run of long-lasting research of a variety of social movements in parallel with the concept of a political opportunity structure (POS), the necessity of introduction of the concept of social opportunity structure (SOS) has emerged. Thirdly, it is the appearance of new notions and concepts which reflect the dynamics of the modern world. Unfortunately, a majority of Russian sociologists continue to 'calk' the terms developed by the western sociologists for entirely different events and contexts. This produces difficulties while translating these terms into Russian and/or entails diffuse comments that often change the meaning of the original term. The most convincing example is the notion of a 'social fact' which is actually now has a non-social (or using the B. Latour's term), a hybrid nature. The consequences of disasters or the processes of socio-ecological metabolism have the hybrid nature as well (Fischer-Kowalski and Haberl 2007). Above all, there is a constructionist sociology (Hannigan 1995) which firstly 'invents' social facts and then introduces the notions which resembles them into the discourse of the sociology of SMs.

Finally, the topic of this article mirrors my personal interest to the problem in question. From 1976 onwards, I took part in a set of international programs and projects initiated and guided by M. Castells, A. Touraine, M. Wieviorka, H. Kriesi, B. Klandermans and many other leading figures in SMs' studies<sup>1</sup>. My participation in the ESA Research network on SMs added an additional interest to the problem of the development of theoretical apparatus for the SMs studies. The period of early 1980s – mid1990s

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, in 1986-91s, I with T. Deelstra from the Netherlands initiated and carried out the comparative research project 'Cities of Europe: The Public's Role in Shaping the Urban Environment' in 16 European countries including the USSR (Deelstra and Yanitsky, 1991). In 1991-94s, I took part in the research project 'New Social Movements in Russia' guided by A. Touraine and M. Wieviorka, etc. I've learned a lot being a member of the ESA Research network on SMs for a decade.

was the time when the founding works on the theory of social movements were issued (Castells 1983; Klandermans *et al.*, 1988; Tarrow 1988 1995; Gamson 1990; Morris and Mueller 1992; Jonston and Klandermans 1995; Kriesi *et al.*, 1995). So that for me, it had been a lucky chance to be simultaneously an insider and distant observer and critic. Naturally, I cannot embrace all the developments in the theory of SMs. I will touch only upon those which seems to me necessary as a researcher of Russian SMs.

In the run of almost 35-years of my study of various Russian SMs (Ianitskii 1991, Ianitskii 1995, Yanitsky 1993, 1999, 2000, 2010, 2011), I have got convinced that it is necessary to formulate more accurately some theoretical instruments without which the analysis of a specificity of these movements in Russia would be incomplete and sometimes incorrect.

## **2. Historical approach and political opportunity structure (POS)**

In western sociology of the SMs there are a lot of historical studies. But in the period I am speaking about a history has been mainly reduced to the notion of POS. It is well understandable because in relation to a SM current history meant POS. In other words, the POS was considered as a master frame which had been not so much different from country to country in Western Europe in those times. Till the beginning of perestroika (1986), Russians had it own POS called ‘administrative-command system’. But after a short period of democratic upsurge, those who studied SMs should do it together with the study of rapidly changing and risk-laden social and political context.

Therefore, I offered to consider the master frames as the lenses by which a collective actor perceived the surrounding world, ie as a paradigm which represented the dominant *world-view of elite* (in Russian condition it has been the world-view of the ruling elite). From my viewpoint, the overall period under consideration (from the late Stalin’s era to recent times) might be presented as three paradigms in consecutive order: The paradigms of system exclusivity, of system adaptability and the new one which could be labeled as the ‘paradigm of regressive stability’. The key point of the first paradigm is that ‘the totalitarian system is a new type of society potentially capable of transforming the whole surrounding world’. The key point of the second paradigm was the idea that ‘the socialism is an indispensable element of world community. Russia as superpower is the factor in its stability and security’. The key idea of the third paradigm sounds as the strong Russian state is the necessary precondition of inner sustainability as well as of maintaining peace in the whole world (Ianitskii 1995). It is clear that at